

deferral of taxation of amounts withheld by a bank or finance company from a dealer in personal property to secure obligations of the dealer, until such time as such amounts are paid to or made available to the dealer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9121. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code, Fiduciary Act, title 26, section 201; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 9122. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9123. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9124. A bill to extend the period of exemption from inspection under the provisions of section 4426 of the Revised Statutes granted certain small vessels carrying freight to and from places on the inland waters of southeastern Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9125. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:

H.R. 9126. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of the House of Representatives as annuitable service under the

Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9127. A bill to create a Federal Youth Office in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9128. A bill relating to the operation and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of reclamation works on rivers and streams tributary to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 434. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should withdraw his invitation to Soviet Premier Khrushchev unless and until all Communist aggression in Laos has stopped; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 379. Resolution providing for the suspension of the rules on Thursday, September 10, 1959, and the balance of the week.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to complete the unrolled portion of Route 8A of the State highway system from a point beginning 10 miles west of Denio, Nev., west to the California State line; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to define, and to cause the Attorney General of the United States to issue an opinion de-

fining, the rights of State legislatures and agencies in enacting statutes and promulgating rules and regulations which apply to State agencies administering Federal grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expression thanks to Hon. Leo O'Brien for the introduction of H.R. 6392, and for supporting legislation advantageous to the health, well-being and welfare of the people of the territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 9129. A bill for the relief of Lennon May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Donati Togneri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9131. A bill for the relief of Mario Menna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9132. A bill for the relief of the parents of the late Salvatore F. Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

274. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Emeryville, Calif., relative to expending every effort in behalf of legislation which will continue the financing of the Federal interstate highway program, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressman Moore To Tour District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close, we all are looking forward to an opportunity to return to our respective States and visit and talk with the people whom we have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

Inasmuch as the First Congressional District of West Virginia is only an hour's time from Washington by modern air travel, I have made every effort to spend as much time in my district even while the Congress was in session. This has permitted me to better help and assist the people in my district and has given me a better than average knowledge of conditions in West Virginia and how the folks back home feel on particular legislative issues. Also, throughout the session, I have maintained an office in the district to better serve my

constituents, and I have made a great many personal appearances and speeches in the seven counties which I represent. However, the limited time which I have been able to spend in my district has not permitted me to travel about as much as I would like, and to talk with persons who have problems on which I, as their Congressman, might be of assistance. Consequently, I am looking forward to adjournment as a time when I might visit each community and hold regular office hours during which time persons might drop in to say hello or to sit down and discuss specific problems.

In preparation for these annual visits in each community, I have made arrangements for office space in various courthouses, post offices, and other civic buildings where it will be convenient to meet and privately discuss problems with individuals, who might want to see me. The following schedule has been arranged and in each instance the time shown is local time in the particular community:

Tuesday, September 29, Hancock County: 10 a.m. to 12 noon, courthouse, New Cumberland; 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., post office building, Weirton.

Wednesday, September 30, Brooke County: 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., courthouse, Wellsburg.

Thursday, October 1, Ohio County: 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., fourth floor, post office building, Wheeling.

Tuesday, October 6, Taylor County: 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., post office building, Grafton.

Wednesday, October 7, Marion County: 9:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., courthouse, Fairmont.

Thursday, October 8, Wetzel County: 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, courthouse, New Martinsville; 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., city hall, Hundred.

Wednesday, October 14, Marion County: 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, post office, Farmington; 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., city hall, Rivesville.

Inasmuch as my district office is situated in Moundsville and is open to the general public 6 days a week, I have scheduled no courthouse visit for Moundsville but my constituents from that area are invited to present any problems they may have at any time to me personally in my district office.

These visits in the various cities and towns are as informal as we can possibly make them, and workers, businessmen,

and housewives are urged to drop by for a chat. No appointments are necessary and all persons are welcome to come as "they are" to see and visit with their Congressman. I hope the tour this year will be as successful as it was last year when we had several hundred people each day stop by our "mobile" office to let me know their feelings on various matters.

As I have stated, my district office, located in the Mercantile Bank Building in Moundsville, is open 6 days a week to serve the residents of the First Congressional District. When I am out of the office on official business, there is always a competent member of my staff available to answer questions or assist persons with their problems. I always welcome having my friends call upon me whenever my services might be of particular assistance.

Public Works Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in our consideration of the latest bill to appropriate funds for Federal public works projects, we have a graphic example of why our Presidents should be given "item veto" powers in appropriation bills.

The President has objected to some 67 new public works starts which will cost us more than \$800 million over the years. These projects have not been eliminated from the bill proposed by the House Appropriations Committee and which is due for a vote on Tuesday.

It is in the interest of our Nation that the President have a means of eliminating objectionable projects from bills such as this one without killing funds for worthwhile projects at the same time. There is no way that these objectionable projects can be extracted without vetoing the whole bill.

Therefore, the President and Congress are faced with the prospect of killing a bill which contains many worthwhile projects or approving a bill which will cost our taxpayers a great deal of extra money.

All of us know that appropriations for new public works projects are deceptive. First-year engineering and construction costs for these projects are relatively small. It is in later years that Congress finds itself in the position of appropriating billions of dollars for projects which quite often should not have been attempted by the Federal Government in the first place.

Tax dollars are hard to come by. Let us save them and balance the budget now and in the future.

In the past 4 years, Congress has tacked on some 200 new projects over and above those projects provided for in the budget. These new starts are going to cost our people some \$3,800 million before they are completed.

It would be wonderful if a Taj Mahal or a Great Wall of China could be constructed in every congressional district in our Nation so that each Member of Congress would have something tangible to which he could point with pride.

But this is one of those times in which Members of Congress should view with alarm.

It is my hope that those Members of Congress who find themselves in the very least embarrassed by this present predicament will keep in mind the necessity and the service to the American people which would result from item-veto powers for our Presidents, the vast majority of whom have sought such powers during the past half century.

These neatly wrapped, expensive packages which are presented to us by the Appropriations Committee unfortunately contain a great number of bad apples along with the good ones.

In rather a unique method, the House Appropriations Committee has come up with its newest solution to this problem.

Instead of eliminating the bad apples, we are asked to slice a 2½-percent chunk off all the apples in the package whether they are good or bad.

This novel approach to the public works program certainly would not meet with the approval of any housewife shopping at the grocery store. If such an alternative were presented to her and she were given no opportunity to eliminate the good from the bad, I believe that her decision would be to eliminate apples from her diet until such time as they were of better uniform quality and content.

The Sad Plight of the Migratory Worker Demands Immediate Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the fall harvest is at hand, and nearly a half million migratory farm workers will begin their trek across the Nation. In the orchards and fields these workers will gather up nature's yield of a bountiful year.

It is truly a shame that these nomadic toilers are not provided with decent housing, wages, and transportation. In some sections of the country they work under considerably better conditions than in others and the wages are more adequate depending upon the location and type of harvest but certainly it cannot be denied that legislation is sorely needed to establish better minimum standards for these people who are frequently overcrowded in totally inadequate housing facilities with lack of beds and bedding and substandard sanitation facilities.

According to the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, some of these workers are required to

sleep in the open, completely exposed to the elements. It is an undeniable fact that these workers are often packed into trucks by the hundreds like sardines for long trips from one area to another.

Tomorrow the Labor Department will conduct hearings which offers some ray of hope for improvement of these conditions and minimum standards for migratory workers.

While these folks choose this type of work and even the way of life it has traditionally required, the fact remains that without them, millions of dollars' worth of fruits and other crops would literally rot on the vine if they did not take to the open country each year.

Among the proposed regulations which will undoubtedly stem from the hearings along with the revelations of the President's Commission report will be: A regulation to provide through State public employment offices, adequate and sanitary housing before such agency will fill any request for workers. This, of course, would mean guarantees conforming to applicable housing and sanitary codes.

The State agencies will probably be required to make sure that pay offered will equal the prevailing rate in the area for similar jobs.

The prospective employer will probably be required to guarantee better transportation than is now provided.

Charging an invasion of States rights some farm State legislators challenge the authority of the Labor Department to implement such regulations. There may be a legal basis for their position. On the other hand, the Justice Department upholds the legality of the Federal Government to legislate standards of this nature. This might or might not be challenged where migratory workers would operate within a State and would not cross State lines in the course of their employment.

Regardless, this is a problem which the legislators can no longer ignore, and legislation at some level should and must be enacted to meet it squarely during the 86th Congress.

Distinguished Service to Agriculture Award to Senator Stuart Symington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take pleasure in including a report of the ceremonies attending the award to Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, made by the Missouri Farmers Association to Senator SYMINGTON, and notes from his address before the annual convention of the Association in acceptance of the award.

The Missouri association is the largest cooperative State association in the Nation and transacts a larger volume of business annually than any other State

agricultural organization. The president of the Missouri Farmers Association, Mr. Fred V. Heinkel, is one of the outstanding agricultural executives of the Nation today.

Senator SYMINGTON before his election to the United States Senate had taken a deep interest in the development of the farm cooperatives of the State and during his service in the Senate has been recognized as an authority on agricultural legislation.

In conferring this distinguished honor upon Senator SYMINGTON at the annual State meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association in session at Columbia, Mo., on August 24, President Heinkel said:

Because of your distinguished record as U.S. Senator from Missouri, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and because of your firm insistence on truth, honesty, and positive action as a member of that committee, because of your perfect 100-percent voting record on farm legislation while a Member of the U.S. Senate; and, further, because of your loyal support of REA, farmer cooperatives, soil and water conservation programs, forestry, and flood control; and because of your sincere interest in the health and well-being of the people of this Nation as a whole, and American farmers in particular, we feel that you have earned and are eminently deserving of the highest honor and award the Missouri Farmers Association has to offer.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Missouri Farmers Association has voted unanimously to bestow upon you the MFA's Award for Distinguished Service to Agriculture.

In response, Senator SYMINGTON said in accepting the distinguished award:

Mr. President, there must be unity in agriculture if we are to have prosperity in agriculture.

Nobody can deny that the American farmer is the forgotten man of our present economic recovery. The record proves that while other groups in our economy have moved forward from last year's recession, the American farmer has moved backward.

Part of that unfortunate record follows:

For the first 6 months of 1959, total national income is up 10 percent over 1958; but farm income is down 8 percent; in fact, parity today is the lowest in 19 years.

For the first time in our history, the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar has sunk below 40 percent.

And as we all know, farmers' expenses are now at record levels.

The record is also clear in showing that the farm policies of this administration are pushing the farmer further toward the bottom of the economic heap. The farmer's share of the Nation's income has declined from 5.2 percent in 1952, to 3.2 percent so far in 1959, a reduction of about 40 percent in less than 7 years.

Unless our great Nation is satisfied with partial economic health, something must be done to bring farm income back to a fair return for work expended.

In addition to the income squeeze, the farmers of America now find themselves in the midst of one of the biggest administrative messes in the history of our Government.

The Government investment in farm commodities has increased from \$2.5 billion in 1952, to \$9 billion in 1959—and at the present rate of increase this investment will be over \$12 billion by this time next year.

The resulting drain on taxpayers is tremendous, as witnessed by the fact the present Secretary of Agriculture has spent more money in his 6½ years in office than all the

previous Secretaries of Agriculture in the history of our country.

Nevertheless Secretary Benson continues to reject congressional attempts to deal with this growing problem.

Of 124 agriculture bills introduced in the Senate, during his term of office, he has opposed all but 14.

Yet despite his promise to the Senate last February 16, Mr. Benson has yet to come up with any overall farm plan of his own.

As an interesting aside, note that processors of agriculture products are now making, in effect, comparable complaints against retailers that farmers have been making over recent years about processors.

If we don't stop this trend toward the vertical, soon a very few people will control it all—and this goes beyond agriculture.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE PLAN

Our agricultural abundance, instead of being an economic curse, can be used as a potent tool in our efforts to build world peace.

We should declare to the people of the world now plagued with hunger and starvation and disease and poverty that the people of the United States are willing to share our abundance—our blessings—of food and fiber.

REA

One of the greatest examples of the value of cooperation and unity in agriculture is in REA.

In 1935, less than 6 percent of our American farms had central station electric power.

Then the wheels of cooperation began to turn. Individual farmers, working hand in hand with their neighbors and with their Government, forged an organization and a network of powerlines which now provide more than 96 percent of our farms with the benefits of electric power.

But even with these outstanding achievements, we must continue to cooperate and unite against those who do not have the best interest of the farmer and REA at heart.

Some of these attacks come from the very people who are supposed to represent the American farmer.

I am glad to announce that, only last Friday, the Senate passed the Aiken resolution, which reaffirmed and restated the sense of Congress that REA shall continue to serve the American farmer.

Here again is the evidence of farmer cooperation through their representatives in Congress, to unite and cooperate to preserve this great institution.

UNITY IN AGRICULTURE

Perhaps this very meeting this week, here in Columbia, Mo., can stimulate wholehearted efforts on the part of farmers, farm leaders, and all of us interested in the future of agriculture, to unite—to speak as one voice.

I pledged my full support toward that goal.

Andrew Jackson May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply saddened by the passing of our former colleague from Kentucky, Andrew Jackson May. "Uncle Jack," as he was affectionately known, served the good mountain people of Kentucky of the Seventh District, for seven terms. He

was the chairman of the old Military Affairs Committee that had to do with the U.S. World War II effort.

I shall never forget that as a new and young Member of the House—back in January 1945—"Uncle Jack" had up before the House the Mobilization of Civilian Manpower—the commonly known work-or-fight bill. Having been retired from the Air Corps a short time before I was elected to Congress in 1944, "Uncle Jack" asked me if I would speak on his committee's bill. He said that it was in trouble. He told me that he thought if I would urge the membership to support the measure—that they would be inclined to do so—since I had just left the armed services. I did speak out on the bill. I took the position that if the Congress could draft a young boy to leave home, train, fight, and even die in the defense of his country—surely then the Congress had the power and the moral obligation to draft a man to work and to fashion the tools, the guns, and the munitions for him to use in his fighting. The bill passed the House and later "Uncle Jack" was kind enough to tell the newspapers that my speech in behalf of the legislation was the difference between victory and defeat of the bill.

Andrew J. May lived to be 84 years of age. He passed away quietly at the hospital in his hometown of Prestonsburg in his beloved Kentucky mountains.

Andrew J. May led nearly every fight for every major piece of legislation that gave our great country her strength, manpower, and her vast striking power during the war. He carried this terrible load of work and great responsibility all during the entire World War II period. Specifically, he piloted the draft bill and the GI bill of rights through the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Andrew May should be remembered for the many, many good things that he did. As one of two members of the Kentucky delegation who served in the House of Representatives with "Uncle Jack"—I want to say that he was, in my opinion, kind, considerate, sympathetic, understanding, sober, and capable. He loved his home, his family, his people, and his State. May God rest his soul in peace.

To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy on this sad occasion, and may the good Lord bless them and keep them always.

Mr. Speaker, there follows excerpts from a story appearing in the New York Times of September 7, 1959:

ANDREW MAY DIES—EX-LEGISLATOR, 84

PRESTONSBURG, Ky., September 6.—Andrew Jackson May, a power in Congress until war-bribe charges destroyed his career, died today in a hospital here. He was 84 years old.

Mr. May's wife, the former Julia Grace children, two of whom survive—Robert and Mrs. Olga May Latta, both of Prestonsburg, Mayo, died in the 1940's. They had three

ATTAINED PROMINENCE IN WAR

An obscure Representative from Kentucky until World War II, Mr. May gained national prominence as head of the powerful House Military Affairs Committee.

He had assumed that post in 1938, after having served in Congress since 1930.

In 1946, the Mead committee, headed by Senator James M. Mead, New York Democrat, began investigation of war contracts. * * * In a speech on the floor of the House, he branded the committee a court of inquisition, described Dr. Garsson as his "very good friend," and said that he had acted out of patriotism in aiding the syndicate.

Mr. May had once said that with a name like his (Andrew Jackson) he had to be a fighter. Ill and worn at 72, he fought hard at his trial to prove that he had never accepted money from the Garsson brothers and that he had not done favors for them that he would not have done for others.

On June 26, 1952, the Kentucky Court of Appeals restored Mr. May to his standing as a lawyer because it was "not in keeping with Christian principles" to deny him another chance. On December 25, 1952, former President Harry S. Truman granted a full Presidential pardon that restored his citizenship rights.

Since then Mr. May had lived in Prestonsburg, less than 15 miles from Langley, where he was born on June 24, 1875.

He began his career as a schoolteacher and later was admitted to the bar and entered politics. From 1901 to 1909, Mr. May was Floyd County attorney. He later was a special judge of the circuit court of Johnson and Martin Counties.

Entering business, Mr. May served as president of the Beaver Valley Coal Co. In 1930, he was elected to the 71st Congress. He was reelected successively until 1947.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 5, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The importance of every vote was demonstrated when the House sustained the President's veto of a public works bill by just one vote. With a two-thirds majority needed to override, each vote to sustain equals, in effect, two votes. The President, bent on balancing our budget, asked for no new starts on projects this year. In this I wholeheartedly concur. Each Member, of course, defines fiscal responsibility his own way, and I was the only Texan to support the President's position on the final vote. Two hundred and seventy-four Members (263 Democrats and 11 Republicans) voted to override, and 138 (132 Republicans and 6 Democrats) to sustain. Starkly dramatic was the demand for a recapitulation, with the Speaker refusing Minority Leader HALLECK's request for an announcement of the vote count before any recapitulation. Several vote switches could have been decisive. The one-vote margin means that each man among the 138 sustainers cast the deciding vote. The possibility of majority reprisals against the 138 became a topic of speculation. The Trinity survey funds were not deleted from the proposed substitute bill, though threatened. In all the political jockeying to take credit, or place blame, any real concern for sensible economizing is often lost.

The 1-cent gas tax increase debate was controversial, but generally not partisan. Argument centered around whether to (1) keep the program pay-as-we-go, by raising tax; (2) keep program at present high level of construction, or stretch it out; (3) dedicate more of highway user taxes to road fund. Everybody was for maintaining the highway program, one way or another. The President's proposal to boost the gas tax temporarily by 1½ cents per gallon was defeated, and a 1-cent increase agreed upon, plus earmarking other present user taxes for the highway fund. I opposed any tax increase (see July 25 and August 1 newsletters) believing that what we need is not more money, but more for our money. I feel we should check carefully into the still unexplained but soaring increases in cost estimates before increasing any taxes.

Another housing bill was vetoed and for practically the same reasons as before. The President has urged extension of FHA's insuring authority, and a slowdown or cutback in most other areas. The bill sent to him went far beyond budgeted figures in programs for college classroom construction loans, direct loans for additional housing for elderly persons, public housing, and urban renewal.

The Government interest rate ceiling brought on a heated debate, and probably this session's least understood one. The technical nature of the Treasury's debt-management problems, and the political appeal of being against "money lenders and their profits" helped muddy the water of fact and truth. Refinancing the national debt, and paying new bills run up by Congress, forces the Treasury Secretary to go into the open market and borrow under the best terms he can get. Yet he must do this under out-of-date Government-set interest rates for loans over 5 years. Unable to do so, he is forced to borrow for shorter terms, on which no such ceilings apply. Result? The Secretary is handicapped in trying to refinance on the best terms possible, and the Government is forced to compete with individuals, families, and small businesses for the short-term money available. The administration proposal to remove arbitrary interest restrictions on all Government borrowing was defeated, and only the interest ceilings on E- and H- (savings) bonds were removed. How the Treasury will refinance \$85 billion of Government indebtedness during the next year was not faced up to, nor was the fact that the credit of the United States and the value of your currency is at stake. The present "political" interest ceilings will wind up costing John Doe Taxpayer much more. And the President has clearly warned that, if they refuse to act, the Democrat leadership in Congress will be responsible for the consequences.

The labor bill conference agreement, generally conforming to the stronger House bill, passed handily, 352-52. Only one Republican was among the 52 staunch labor supporters who opposed. While on labor affairs, two other items, appearing in the RECORD this week are worthy of note: (1) a quotation of Senator KENNEDY's apt and honest description of his labor bill as "worked out carefully with President Meany and his lawyers" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 3, p. 18029, and (2) a résumé of Congress-threatening James B. Carey's past affiliations with Communist front organizations as well as his opposition to them upon occasion (RECORD, Aug. 31, p. 17460).

Another National Guard armory in Dallas was included in the military construction conference report adopted this week.

Khrushchev's visit opposition may at least prove to him that the American people are not taken in by his duplicity. It is my fervent hope and prayer that (1) he will sense the tremendous "sleeping giant" strength of the American people, so he will not miscalcu-

late our ability and determination, (2) that more good than harm comes from his visit here. Khrushchev's visit is of grave concern to most here and ever present in the thoughts of many, despite preoccupation.

The President's Veto of the Housing Bill Brings Protest From the People at Home Who Realize What the Effect Will Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. MCFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who worked and voted for good housing legislation only to have the wishes of the majority thwarted by Presidential opposition three times in the past 2 years are understandably disturbed and disappointed.

But even more concerned are the people on the home front who are faced with the prospects of no housing legislation because of the veto.

I am hopeful that before we adjourn we will enact a new housing bill, as good or even better than the defeated bill of 1958, the trimmed down vetoed bill No. 1 of 1959 or the even further curtailed but still vetoed bill No. 2 of 1959.

Every person in the country is hurt if our housing program is stopped, not only the real estate salesmen, builders, carpenters, and suppliers who are direct effected by shutdown of the FHA program, but all the others who are indirectly hurt.

Following are telegraphic comments from some of those in the 11th District of California who know firsthand the harm that is being done by these vetoes:

From Dean C. DeCarli, mayor of Stockton:

The city of Stockton is extremely disappointed over the veto of the housing bill by the President. As this bill is needed to assist us in financing our West End redevelopment project to provide for a needed 200 units of public housing and to provide for Federal assistance for displaced people, we urgently request that you override the President's veto.

From John E. Hirtten, executive director, Redevelopment Agency, city of Stockton:

Veto of housing bill will have serious effect on entire urban renewal and housing program for the city. Completely stops possibility of renewal and redevelopment of 200 acres West End skidrow area. Also kills 200 public housing units needed to replace obsolete city owned Lanham Act war housing. We appreciate your efforts in the past and once again implore your assistance to override the President's veto. Two years without appropriate housing legislation will certainly restrict our programs and hurt interest and initiative shown by citizens of this community. It can truthfully be said that the lack of housing legislation will have detrimental affects on our community and its economy. Of all legislation the housing

bill comes closest to paying for itself in increased tax base of communities and their economy.

From C. P. Kenyon, administrator, San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors:

The President's veto of the housing bill affects several vital projects in San Joaquin County. We feel that the public housing bill should be passed and we urge your vote to override the President's veto.

From Henry Hansen, secretary of the Central Labor Council of Stockton:

Housing bill is vital to Stockton. Appreciate your support to override the veto.

From executive director of the San Joaquin County Housing Authority, Allen R. Reed:

Thank you for your letter of August 28 and your attached newsletter No. 34 on the subject of difficulty of enacting good housing legislation. We were both somewhat surprised and shocked when we learned of the President's veto of the second housing bill. All we can do at this time is to express our appreciation for your good work and await the outcome of the override action. In a telephone conversation with the Commissioners today they asked me to express their most heartfelt appreciation for your work and support of the housing bills.

Time To Curb Excessive Jet Noise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the price of material progress is sometimes too high in terms of its effects on the health, safety, and comfort of human beings. Such an instance appears to be the increasing concern felt by many at the impact of jet noise on the people who live in the vicinity of airports which service commercial jet aircraft.

This problem is especially important at the major airports in the New York metropolitan area, including the Newark Airport which is adjacent to the district I represent.

I was pleased, therefore, to note that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a hearing today at New York's Idlewild International Airport for the purpose of inquiring into the situation. I am hopeful the subcommittee will be able to offer constructive ideas, for it is apparent that the Federal Government has at least a measure of responsibility for controlling the excesses of jet noise.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a brief item from the Sunday New York Times of September 6, which cites the particularly bad noise record of certain domestic airlines using jet aircraft in contrast to flag carriers of other nations. I also include a longer story from United Press International which appeared in the same issue of the New York Times, and which describes the growing concern throughout the country.

Finally, I include the text of a statement I prepared for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce subcommittee hearing in New York today.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1959]

AIRLINE CRITICIZED FOR JET NOISE HERE

Of five airlines operating jet planes out of New York International Airport, Idlewild, Queens, American Airlines is the only one in "willful disregard of the public welfare" by making noisy takeoffs, the port authority charged yesterday.

John R. Wiley, aviation director of the port authority, which operates the airport, said that American Airlines conformed to noise standards in only 64.3 percent of its takeoffs from Idlewild during August.

Trans World Airlines conformed on 68.3 percent of its takeoffs, he added, an improvement over its 59.6 percent conformance during July, but still "far below the acceptable level."

Pan American conformed 91.8 percent, while Aerolineas Argentinas and British Overseas Airways Corp. conformed on all their takeoffs.

There are 25 takeoffs of jet planes daily at Idlewild. Residents of the Jamaica Bay area have complained of noisy takeoffs and landings.

A public hearing into these complaints will be opened at 10 a.m. tomorrow on the fifth floor of the control tower at Idlewild by a House of Representatives subcommittee.

A spokesman for American Airlines said yesterday that his company was "following closely" the voluntary procedures for noise reduction set up by the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee. This organization consists of delegates from all domestic airlines, the pilots' union, and the Federal Aviation Agency.

[From the New York Times, Sept 6, 1959]
PROTESTS OVER JET NOISE MOUNT TO A NEW PITCH AROUND AIRPORTS—SLEEPLESS RESIDENTS SEEK FLIGHT CURBS—PROBLEM IS MOST ACUTE IN NEW YORK, SAN FRANCISCO, AND LOS ANGELES

WASHINGTON, September 5.—America's new jet airliners, conquerors of distance and time, are not doing so well with people on the ground.

Specifically, those irate citizens live near airports and complain vociferously that jet noises is interfering with life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The airlines are frankly worried. The organized protests have reached such proportions that some citizens' groups are demanding a curfew on all jet landings and takeoffs between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. They have taken their fight to Congress and to the Federal Aviation Agency.

The chief trouble spots appear to be in New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. This is the situation in those three cities.

New York: John T. Clancy, Queens Borough president, is spearheading the opposition, directed mainly against jet operations at New York International Airport, Idlewild, Queens.

It was Mr. Clancy who proposed that no jet landings or takeoffs be permitted at Idlewild during sleeping hours—and he would extend that curfew even to LaGuardia Airport, which has no jet service. He also has threatened to start sewer construction projects in Queens that would block traffic into both airports.

San Francisco: San Francisco's International Airport is surrounded on three sides by the bay, and annoyance is limited to one residential area—the city of South San Francisco with a population of 40,000.

For more than a year this community has had an antinnoise committee that holds frequent meetings. It even hired a noise expert.

SCHOOLS PROTEST

The complaints center around more than loss of sleep. The South San Francisco school district has at least twelve schools directly under the takeoff pattern, and school officials are considering legal action to keep jet noise from interrupting classes. So loud and frequent have been the complaints that a special telephone had to be installed at the airport to handle them.

Los Angeles: Several local groups from areas near Los Angeles International Airport have formed antinnoise committees without getting much more than sympathy.

One school has filed complaints that classes have been stopped by noise. A single rally drew more than 1,000 persons, but the protesting committees have backed away from a proposal to move the airport itself; too many people, including some of the complainants, make their living at the airport.

COMMITTEE FORMED

A group called the Los Angeles Sound Abatement Coordinating Committee has been formed, with the aid of the airlines, Government, and airport officials.

What can be done about the noise problem? The question was put to pilots, the Federal Aviation Agency and the airlines themselves. Their unhappy but unanimous answer: Not an awful lot, for these reasons:

The jets are equipped with sound suppressors (at a cost of \$25,000 per plane), but, while they reduce noise to a certain extent, a lot more work must be done in this field.

The FAA, the airlines, and the pilots put safety ahead of noise nuisance. Whenever possible, they try to use preferential runways that avoid settled areas.

RUNWAYS LIMITED

But the preferential runway solution is limited by the low number of such runways. Most airports have only one, and it is not always possible to use it. Under most conditions, particularly hot weather, jets must use the longest runway and this is not always the preferential one.

Some complaining city officials have insisted that pilots climb faster to reduce the noise problem. Pilots already are instructed to attain at least 1,200 feet of altitude as quickly as possible and also hold that altitude as long as possible before landing. Any faster climb than that is impossible under the existing air traffic control situation.

Such drastic solutions as a night curfew would wreck the airlines. For example, suspending all flight operations in New York from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. would mean that no New York-bound flight could leave Los Angeles after 2:30 p.m. Pacific coast time.

The Federal Aviation Agency is sturdily resisting demands that it take action to reduce noise annoyances. It is convinced not much could be done at present unless the protesting groups wanted to ruin commercial aviation and it believes the noise problem must be settled largely on a community level, not by the Federal Government.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, SIXTH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF COMMERCIAL JET AIRCRAFT AT AIRPORTS IN THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN AREA, SEPTEMBER 7, 1959, AT THE NEW YORK INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity of presenting this statement for your consideration. The problems related to the operation of commercial jet aircraft from the three major airports in the metropolitan New York area—that is, Idlewild, LaGuardia, and Newark Airports—are of intense and in-

creasing concern to the people who live in the areas surrounding these airports.

As the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, a portion of which lies adjacent to the Newark Airport, I am concerned for the health and safety and comfort of a great many of my constituents, all of which are jeopardized by the frequent use by jet aircraft of Newark Airport.

I hope that the subcommittee, in considering these problems, will give equal attention to all three airports. The problems are the same in each; all three airports serve the same area; all three are operated by the same Port of New York Authority; and, as the subcommittee is aware, Newark Airport has been utilized, more and more often, as a supplemental airport for traffic originally scheduled for Idlewild and LaGuardia when these airports are unable to handle them adequately.

Before any of the substantive problems can be solved, it seems to me, there is a fundamental need to fix responsibility among the several agencies involved with commercial aviation in this area, to determine the specific jurisdiction and the extent of authority which each is assigned. I refer, of course, to the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Port of New York Authority, and the voluntary National Air Transport Coordinating Committee. In my own experience and in that of other Members of Congress, there has been in recent years a great deal of ambiguity and confusion and avoidance of responsibility whenever efforts are made to control the operation of aircraft in the area in the interests of the general public.

Specifically, I believe that Congress must determine what agencies have effective authority to impose necessary conditions upon the operation of aircraft, both in the air and on the ground, in order to restrict noise and otherwise provide for the safety and health and reasonable comfort of those who reside in the vicinity of the airports. If sufficient authority has not been granted to date, then I believe further that Congress should undertake the responsibility of assigning it—in clear and specific terms.

For these reasons, I have supported House Resolution 162, introduced by our colleague, Mr. Bosch, of New York, which would establish a select committee to study these problems. However, in the event this subcommittee, with its extensive background of experience in the field, would be willing to undertake such a study, then I should be among the first to encourage you to do so.

Certainly, the seriousness of the noise problem justifies your attention. As part of its noise reduction procedure for jet aircraft, the Port of New York Authority set a maximum level of 112 perceived noise decibels. While this level is extremely liberal when compared with the 60 decibels level which medical and acoustical authorities have recommended for the hours from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m., even this high level has been frequently exceeded by aircraft operating out of New York area airports.

Levels, for instance, of 124 decibels and 129 decibels have been verified by the Port of New York Authority as having been reached by jet aircraft operating in the area within the past 2 months. In understanding these figures, please remember that 140 decibels represents the very top of the sound scale, that physical pain will be experienced at sound levels above 130 decibels, and that a level of 108 decibels (substantially below the maximum set by the Port of New York Authority) is the equivalent of the noise produced by 30 Niagara Falls roaring simultaneously.

It is obvious that exposure to constant noise disturbances of these magnitudes will seriously affect the health and comfort of people living in the area over which jet air-

craft must operate flying in and flying out of New York airports.

A section of Elizabeth, N.J., called Elizabethport, is situated within 1 mile of the most heavily utilized runway at Newark Airport. This is the runway, you will recall, which was specially built following three successive crashes of aircraft operating out of the Newark Airport in a very small section of Elizabeth. Planes which land or take off from this runway in a southerly direction fly over the Elizabethport section at levels below 400 feet—considerably lower than even the most liberal permissible minimum altitude.

Despite the past assurances of Port of New York Authority officials, these aircraft increasingly are jet aircraft, since jets have recently been permitted to use Newark Airport as an alternative to Idlewild and LaGuardia. On recent evenings, as many as five huge jet transports have thundered over this residential section of Elizabeth at incredibly low altitudes. The effect on the population has been upsetting and disturbing in the extreme. One of my constituents, for example, has been forced to replace no less than nine ceilings during the past few years as a result of the physical shock of the sound of constant low-flying aircraft. The cost of this situation in terms of lost sleep, impaired health, and shaken nerves is, of course, incalculable.

Yet, the justified complaints of our people go unheard and increasingly, in fact, unacknowledged. If the public agencies involved, or the airlines themselves, displayed any determined effort to correct this menace or to develop noise controls of one kind or another, then there might be cause for hope. But as far as we can determine there is little or no serious effort being made to live up to the obligations toward the general public inherent in the public franchise enjoyed by airlines and in the responsibilities of public regulatory agencies.

As a last resort, we are seeking the assistance of the Congress: first, to define the areas of authority and responsibility, and then to see to it that the rights of the people to protection of their health and safety are respected.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Is Space the Way to Peace and Abundance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] is not only one of the ablest but one of the most devoted and serious-minded Members of the Congress, enjoying the respect of his colleagues and the confidence of Speaker RAYBURN and myself. He is one of the most active members of the newly established, important Committee on Science and Astronautics and is chairman of one of its subcommittees.

Congressman ANFUSO attended the 10th Annual Congress of the International Astronautical Federation that was held in London, England, on September 4, 1959, and delivered a splendid and informative address to the members attending this particular congress. The address being entitled "Is Space the Way to Peace and Abundance?"

In my remarks I am pleased to include the excellent address made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]:

IS SPACE THE WAY TO PEACE AND ABUNDANCE?
(Address by the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO at the 10th Annual Congress of the International Astronautical Federation, London, England, September 4, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of this congress, and guests, at the outset, I wish to congratulate the members of the International Astronautical Federation and particularly its illustrious president, Mr. Andrew G. Haley, for bringing us together. Mr. Haley, as an organizer and as a pioneer in the field of international cooperation and space law, has no peer.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, I feel that on this occasion we can share a few thoughts of common interest.

Let us first face the fact that never in its history has the world been so near to destroying itself; that never before has so much deception in diplomacy been practiced and that never has there been so much talk of peace, while all the planning is for war. The situation is like inviting someone to your home for dinner, while making arrangements for his demise.

It is in this kind of world that we must seek the ingredients for peace.

We know that man has already discovered a new world—many times larger than the world Columbus found—but it is one of unexplored horizons. We have opened the door to the heavens' pathless way. The questions now being asked are these: Will what we find there be good or evil? Will it prove to be a boon to humanity, or are we getting nearer to the day of destruction?

As we look back over the recent past, it is hard to believe that man's efforts to penetrate outer space came to fruition less than 2 years ago. Prior to that time, most people regarded satellite orbits and interplanetary travel as nothing more than the fantasies of children or visionaries, of comic-strip cartoonists or science-fiction writers. During these past 2 years everyone has come to recognize that the practicality of space flight has been demonstrated. The impact of all this on people's minds has been unprecedented. Of all the wonders wrought by the progress of science and technology, it seems to me that none before—not even nuclear energy—has opened such vistas for mankind. Certainly none has ever promised to free us, while still alive, from the earth itself.

At this great international gathering, it is fitting to review the material benefits, in new knowledge and the practical applications thereof, which we may reasonably expect from man's future explorations in outer space. No less important is it for us to consider the prospects that may be offered for permanent world peace. But we must not let ourselves be so dazzled by these glittering possibilities that we forget the deeper meaning of our emergence into outer space. I refer, of course, to man's moral sense, his curiosity and capacity for wonder, his faith and reverence in God, and his spirit of adventure.

I shall not waste the time of this learned audience with details of the possibilities which the exploration of space has to offer. As a layman, I am interested in the practical aspects of these discoveries and particularly how this will affect our daily lives. I am interested, for example, in the observation made by Dr. James Van Allen who said that the progress of space science and technology will bring (and I quote):

"A rich and continuing harvest of important practical applications. Many of these applications will be of military value; but their greater value will be to the civilian community at large."

Dr. Fred Whipple, Director of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, said:

"Weather forecasting, in my opinion, will become a science instead of an art. I predict that its value to the country will greatly outweigh the cost of the entire (space) program."

Dr. Wernher von Braun said that communication satellites will not only pay for themselves, "but pay for trips to the moon and other ventures in this business."

The few examples I have cited could be multiplied many times. They are the serious predictions of responsible and eminent men.

I am convinced that the expansion of knowledge and its applications can be speeded up by providing greater incentive for scientific and engineering efforts. Accordingly, I introduced a bill in Congress in April of this year, known as H.R. 6288. It calls for the creation of a Presidential Medal of Science, which is to be awarded to persons who make outstanding contributions in the physical, biological, mathematical or engineering sciences. Needless to say, achievements in the space sciences and technology are included. My bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives on August 19, 1959, and 2 days later by the Senate of the United States. I trust that this law will serve as an incentive for further scientific progress.

I am further convinced that the progress of space science and technology and the peaceful uses of outer space will be greatly facilitated by a full partnership of cooperating nations. Many projects in outer space, which could benefit all mankind, would be literally impossible without international cooperation, for example, if they required the use of worldwide tracking or telemetering equipment or of launching sites in certain geographical locations. Costs alone will prevent some nations, or even any one nation, from undertaking certain ambitious space operations. Some of these space projects can be done better and more cheaply if they are carried out as joint enterprises of two or more nations.

There is reason to hope that a good deal of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space will be forthcoming in the foreseeable future. A good beginning has already been made. The cooperation of many nations in the International Geophysical Year (IGY) and the Committee on Space Research (Cospar) established by the International Council of Scientific Unions, has been most encouraging. Even the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has produced some valuable results, although several nations have refused to participate in its work on the

ground that its membership is unrepresentative. This situation should be corrected as soon as possible.

I propose that all governments interested in the peaceful uses of outer space should create a Committee on Space Cooperation, with fair representation from the Communist and non-Communist worlds. In my opinion, the Committee should be established within the framework of the United Nations. In any event, its functions would be the exploration and development of outer space in the common interest of all mankind. If subcommittees were subsequently formed in the various member nations, I would hope that in my own country, at least, suitable representation would be provided for science, industry, and the Government, and that both the legislative and executive branches of Government would be represented in its membership.

The challenge of outer space demands a full and true partnership, first among nations, then among science, industry, and government. To deny such participation in the peaceful exploits into outer space would widen the no man's land barrier presently existing between the Western and Communist worlds and would invite further full-scale competition. The discoveries then, on both sides, could easily be diverted, not to create a peaceful and closer knit world of abundance where no one need be in want, but to create even more menacing ways of destroying the world than we have today. Thus we would all be the losers in such competition.

Prior to attending this meeting, I addressed letters to both President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev urging that they discuss this one area of possible agreement as a step toward world unity. I have further suggested that this proposal be given consideration by the United Nations and the NATO powers prior to the meeting of the heads of state.

An example of what can be done by joint peaceful cooperation is the agreement reached in April of this year between the United States and Canada in ionospheric research.

Another example is the agreement announced only July 29 of this year between the United States and Great Britain under which agreement British scientists will prepare the instrumentation for satellites to be put into orbit by the United States.

Still another forward step in the joint use of outer space is being taken by the International Telecommunications Union, which is meeting at this moment in Geneva.

I believe that agreement on space frequencies could set a pattern for multilateral cooperation in other space activities.

Through their partnership in outer space, nations can learn the ways of meaningful cooperation on earth. Certainly cooperation is a more fruitful and more effective method than coercion—or even mere co-existence—if our goals are peace and abundance.

Whether mankind's emergence into outer space will serve the cause of peace is still a matter of hope, rather than conviction. It is true that space technology can be used for either peace or war. For that very reason, however, war has become all the more obnoxious and impractical. General Lemnitzer, the U.S. Army Chief of Staff, predicted recently that missiles will soon create "strategic nuclear disarmament," becoming so numerous and relatively invulnerable that no attack can prevent retaliation.

Regardless of such military considerations, I feel strongly that an arms race to dominate outer space must be avoided. National rivalries should be confined to the earth—and, if possible, buried there for all times.

Some observers have suggested that enterprises in outer space will provide mankind with a moral equivalent of war. Early in this century, the American philosopher and psychologist, William James, made the following comment:

"What we now need to discover in the social realm is the moral equivalent of war; something heroic that will speak to men as universally as war does and yet will be as compatible with their spiritual selves as war has proved itself to be incompatible."

We may reasonably conjecture that in the vastness of outer space man may at last find a moral equivalent of war, to evoke and satisfy his longing for adventure, his fascination with the unknown, his need to be challenged and tested to the final limit of his strength.

In addition, it is fortunate that space technology may provide the means, at long last, to maintain world peace. The risk of surprise attack, for example, could be minimized by a system of international satellite surveillance.

Perhaps the immensity of the cosmos and the new knowledge of its mysteries resulting from space exploration will bring the peoples of the world closer together in new patterns of cooperation. Is it too much to hope that man's mind and spirit will expand with the scope of his activities?

Let me conclude by saying that space can be, if we will, a way to world peace as well as abundance. If earthmen can get together on this one thing—the peaceful exploration of outer space—then that very space can be the way to the creation of a world of abundance, making war outmoded and unnecessary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1959

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 5, 1959)

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou guide of our pilgrim way, out of all our frustrations and fond plans that have never come to fruition, out of all the bitter sense of failure to make of ourselves the sort of person we aspire in high hours to be, nevertheless, we come feeling that round our incompleteness

flows Thy greatness and round our restlessness Thy rest.

Thou dost offer to us that abiding peace which is beyond the measure of man's mind. Always Thy still small voice, if we but listen, whispers even as we make our false choices, "Come unto me, all ye who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Give us to see, we beseech Thee, that our misused freedom, our cheap pleasures, our fatal self-indulgence, so often bar us from Thee who art our very life. Forgiving our foolish ways:

"Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

Amen.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills, petitions, and memorials, and the transaction of other routine business, with the limitation on statements of not to exceed 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object after we have a quorum call—I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I not have the right to make an-